

**FOLEY & LARDNER LLP**  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
1530 PAGE MILL ROAD  
PALO ALTO, CA 94304  
TELEPHONE: (650) 251-1114  
FAX: (650) 856-3710

DAVID B. MOYER, BAR NO. 197739  
dmoyer@foley.com

**FOLEY & LARDNER LLP**  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
3000 K ST., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20007  
TELEPHONE: 202.672.5300  
FACSIMILE: 202.672.5399

ANTHONY H. SON, BAR NO. 190478  
ason@foley.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS,  
NEC CORPORATION, NEC ELECTRONICS AMERICA,  
INC., NEC AMERICA, INC., NEC DISPLAY  
SOLUTIONS OF AMERICA, INC., NEC SOLUTIONS  
(AMERICA), INC., NEC UNIFIED SOLUTIONS, INC.  
.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NEC CORPORATION, NEC ELECTRONICS  
AMERICA, INC., NEC AMERICA, INC., NEC  
DISPLAY SOLUTIONS OF AMERICA, INC.,  
NEC SOLUTIONS (AMERICA), INC., NEC  
UNIFIED SOLUTIONS, INC.

Plaintiffs,

v.

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED,  
INC., CHARLES H. MOORE, and PATRIOT  
SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION,

Defendants.

Case No. C-05-4847-JCS

**LOCAL RULE 3-13 NOTICE OF  
PENDENCY OF OTHER ACTION  
OR PROCEEDING**

1 A patent infringement case recently filed in the Eastern District of Texas involves the  
 2 same subject matter and substantially the same parties as does this case. *See Technology*  
 3 *Properties Ltd. v. Fujitsu Limited, et al.*, 2:05-cv-494-TJW (“the Texas case”). Both cases  
 4 present the question whether the NEC Plaintiffs in this action<sup>1</sup> infringe any valid and enforceable  
 5 claim of U.S. Patent 5,809,336 (“the '336 patent”) or two other patents in the '336 patent family.  
 6 The Texas case also poses that question as to other alleged infringers, who have now also filed  
 7 declaratory judgment actions in this Court.<sup>2</sup> Plaintiffs in those cases have, together with the  
 8 NEC Plaintiffs, filed a Local Rule 3-12 motion seeking to have their cases and this one related to  
 9 each other and to *Patriot Scientific Corporation v. Fujitsu Microelectronics America, Inc. et al.*,  
 10 Case No. C 03-05787 (SBA). *See* Exhibit 1. The Patriot Scientific case also accused Fujitsu  
 11 Computer Systems Corporation, Matsushita Electric Corporation of America, NEC Solutions  
 12 (America), Inc., Sony Electronics, Inc., and Toshiba America, Inc. of infringing the '336 patent  
 13 and had been pending in this Court for almost two years when the Texas case was filed. The  
 14 Patriot Scientific case was itself the combination of five different cases that had been filed in  
 15 four different jurisdictions and then referred to the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation. By  
 16 stipulation, those cases were consolidated in the Northern District of California in Case No. C  
 17 03-05787 (SBA).

18 The NEC Plaintiffs do not believe that this case should be transferred pursuant to 28  
 19 U.S.C. § 1407 — rather, the Texas case should be dismissed, stayed or transferred here. In case  
 20 management statements filed in the Patriot Scientific case, Technology Properties Limited  
 21 (“TPL”) informed this Court that it would be stepping in as plaintiff and filing an amended  
 22 complaint. By an October 4 Order in that action, the Court gave TPL until October 24 to do so.  
 23

---

24 <sup>1</sup> NEC Corporation, NEC Electronics America, Inc., NEC America, Inc., NEC Display  
 25 Solutions Of America, Inc., NEC Solutions (America), Inc., and NEC Unified Solutions, Inc.

26 <sup>2</sup> (1) *Fujitsu Computer Systems Corporation, et al. v. Patriot Scientific Corporation, et*  
 27 *al.*, Case No. C 05-4837 (PVT); (2) *Toshiba America, Inc. et al. v. Patriot Scientific*  
 28 *Corporation, et al.*, Case No. C 05-4838 (RS); (3) *Panasonic Corporation of North America, et*  
*al. v. Patriot Scientific Corporation, et al.*, Case No. C 05-4844 (RS); and (4) *JVC Americas*  
*Corporation v. Patriot Scientific Corporation, et al.*, Case No. C 05-4845 (JCS).

1 On October 24, instead of filing an amended complaint as it represented it would do, TPL filed  
2 the Texas case and then, roughly one hour later, dismissed the Patriot Scientific case.

3 If TPL serves the complaint it filed in the Texas case (which it so far has not done), the  
4 NEC Plaintiffs intend to move to dismiss, stay or transfer that case to this District, in order to  
5 halt TPL's blatant attempt to forum-shop and to make an end-run around this Court's case  
6 management efforts.

7 Dated: December 5, 2005

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

8 By: /s/ Anthony H. Son

9 Anthony H. Son

10 David B. Moyer

11 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

12 *NEC Corporation, NEC Electronics America,*  
13 *Inc., NEC America, Inc., NEC Display Solutions*  
14 *of America, Inc., NEC Solutions America, Inc.,*  
15 *NEC Unified Solutions, Inc.*